



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,264	12/03/2003	Bret Alan Gorsline	002566-73 (019000)	4901
64313 7590 06/26/2008 NIXON PEABODY LLP 401 Ninth Street, N.W. Suite 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER				
FABER, DAVID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/727,264

Applicant(s)

GORSLINE ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID FABER

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is made in response to the amendment filed on 28 April 2008.
2. Claims 46-53, 63-73, and 80-90 have been amended.
3. The objections to claims 50, 67, and 84 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 46, 50, 51, 53, 54, 59-62, 63, 67, 68, 70, 71, 76-79, 80, 84, 85, 87, 88, and 93-96 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Evan et al (US PGPub 20020036654, published 3/28/2002) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 47-48, 64-65, and 81-82 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al in further view of Alao et al (US PGPub 20020147645, published 10/10/2002) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 49, 52, 58, 66, 69, 75, 83, 86, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al in further view of Larson (US PG Pub 20020188635, published 12/12/2002) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 55, 72, and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evans et al has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment. The rejection of claims 57, 74, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al in further view of Aphek (US PG Pub 20030191693, filed 4/8/2002) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. Claims 46-96 are pending. Claims 46, 63, and 80 are independent claims.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The phrase "storage device" is not found to have proper antecedent basis in the specification; however it is necessary to use this terminology in order to properly define the claim within the boundaries of statutory subject matter. In order to overcome the object, an amendment to the specification is necessary constituting a non-exhaustive statement of what the phrase "storage device" would be as it would have been known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in order to verify that the term "storage device," could not be taken in the context of non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 63-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

For your reference, below is a section from MPEP 2105 :

(a) Functional Descriptive Material: "Data Structures" Representing Descriptive Material Per Se or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings Per Se
Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not

define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.

Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions.

Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. Office personnel should determine whether the computer program is being claimed as part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such a case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim. The same result occurs when a computer program is used in a computerized process where the computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer program. Only when the claimed invention taken as a whole is directed to a mere program listing, i.e., to only its description or expression, is it descriptive material per se and hence nonstatutory.

Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program's instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim. See paragraph IV.B.2(b), below. When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.

8. Claims 63-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 63-79 disclose a system; however, the claims fail to disclose if this system indicate any hardware since The use of the word "system" does not inherently mean that claim is directed to a physical machine. Claims 80-96 disclose a storage device; however, the claims and the specification fail to disclose if this storage device indicates any hardware therefore the storage device representing a data structure. The claims appear to be claiming "software systems" i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is a computer program per se. Since the

claims disclose computer program per se that is not embodied on a computer readable medium, they appear non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 46, 49-55, 58-63, 66-72, 75-80, 83-89, and 92-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al (US PGPub 20020036654, published 3/28/2002) in further view of Yasnovsky et al (US PG Pub 20050027594, filed 11/3/2003, provisional application filed on 7/28/2003)

As per independent Claim 46, Evans et al discloses a method comprising:

- receiving an aggregate creative definition, the aggregate creative definition being associated with an aggregate creative that is selectable by an advertising system; (Paragraph 0058; FIG 3, 302-304 - Discloses a number of advertising formats the user is able to choose from. Once the format is selected, the user chooses from a plurality of templates related to the advertising format. (Paragraph 0063))
- selecting, in accordance with the aggregate creative definition, at least one set of subcreatives of more than one subcreative from a plurality of subcreatives in the advertising system, (Paragraph 0071 discloses the use ad

areas on templates, wherein the template (set) include product references (subcreatives) that include an image reference of the product and text reference; wherein the template includes multiple ad areas (or placement for multiple sets) (Paragraph 0069) In addition, product references also include SKU numbers, barcodes, trademarks, logos, etc. These product references are retrievable from one or more databases. (Paragraph 0076-0077)) Furthermore, the user has the ability to create its own product ad contain product references from a database of product references (Paragraph 0066-0068)

- assembling a plurality of aggregate creative forms, each aggregate creative form comprising one or more of the subsets of subcreatives in accordance with the aggregate creative definition; (Each template may contain multiple ad areas (Paragraph 0069) which each ad area able to contain more than one product references (Paragraph 0068, Page 6, lines 5 – 14; Paragraph 0071. Therefore, Paragraph 0088, Paragraph 0095: Discloses one embodiment wherein a template and a list of product references are submitted to a assistance layout program that lays out the product references into the template. Here, the computer would read the list of product references, select the product reference, obtain the product reference and place it into template based on the instructions of either priority based or order-based from the list. Each product being advertised has multiple product references from which the assistance layout program may choose. Since the program has multiple

product references to choose from, it provides greater flexibility creating multiple advertisements. Thus a process of creating a computer-created advertisement, hence using a computer that is used to create ads using an automated assembly. Furthermore, it is implicitly known if the Evans et al's method is capable of performing the functionality once, then it may generate the same functionality over again. Thus multiple computer-created advertisements have the functionality to be generated.)

- storing the plurality of aggregate creative forms, the plurality of aggregate creative forms associated with the aggregate creative in the advertising system; and when the aggregate creative is selected for transmission to users on an electronic network by the advertising system, selecting one of the plurality of stored aggregate creative forms associated with the aggregate creative, and retrieving the selected aggregate creative form for the transmission. (Paragraph 0091 discloses the user accounts service that provides access to a memory storage device that the user may store data. Thus, a user using an Internet connection may store product references, templates and other custom information such as user's files, and data. In addition, the final advertisements may stored on emails or websites. (Paragraph 0052) Furthermore, the user has the ability to have the advertisement that was just created be transmitted to users via a printer, email or posted on a web site (Paragraphs 0051, 0052, 0092, 0095, Claim 17)

However, Evans et al fails to specifically disclose rotating through the at least one set of more than one subcreative; and selecting, during the step of rotating, a plurality of subsets of subcreatives to be included in the plurality of aggregate creative forms, the plurality of subsets of subcreatives including different combinations of more than one subcreative. However, Yasnovsky et al discloses of a location on a web page that may contain only three ads at a time (three ad spots for three different adds) out a possible 100 ads to use; wherein the each ad may contain text+link, graphic+link etc. Yasnovsky discloses each time the ads are presented in each of the three ad spots, each ad spot places an ad through in rotation. In other words, each ad spot rotates through a different ad each time. (Paragraph 0035-0036, 0041-0042) Thus for each time the web page is viewed, a different combination of three ads are presented based rotating of 100 ads shown three at a time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Application's invention to have modified Evan's advertisements creation method with Yasnovsky et al's feature of rotating ads since it would have provided the benefit of cost efficiently reach advertisers that want to place only a limited number of ads.

As per dependent claim 49, Claim 49 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 50, Claim 50 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 51, Claim 51 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 52, Claim 52 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 53, Evans et al discloses wherein the plurality of subcreatives includes graphic subcreatives, text subcreatives, (Paragraph 0071, lines 5-8) However, Evan et al fails to specifically disclose hyperlink subcreatives. However, based on the rejection rotating through the at least one set of more than one subcreative; and selecting, during the step of rotating, a plurality of subsets of subcreatives to be included in the plurality of aggregate creative forms, the plurality of subsets of subcreatives including different combinations of more than one subcreative. by Yasnovsky, and the rationale incorporated, Yasnovsky discloses hyperlink subcreatives. (Paragraph 0041)

As per dependent claim 54, Evans et al discloses the plurality of sets of subcreatives include different numbers of subcreatives. (Paragraph 0066, 0075, 0076)

As per dependent claim 55, Evans et al fails to specifically disclose wherein at least two of the sets of subcreatives share one or more common subcreatives. However, Evans discloses an embodiment of utilize multiple databases of product references wherein one database of references is for advertising nationally, while another database of references is for advertising locally. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention that the same product reference be stored and used nationally and locally since it would provide the benefit of getting advertised at a national scale for more attention, but the same time, advertising a product that has well-known positive feedback in a local area.

As per dependent claim 58, Evans et al fails to specifically disclose the step of tracking transmitted subcreatives transmitted to users on the electronic network. However, based on the rejection rotating through the at least one set of more than one subcreative; and selecting, during the step of rotating, a plurality of subsets of subcreatives to be included in the plurality of aggregate creative forms, the plurality of subsets of subcreatives including different combinations of more than one subcreative. by Yasnovsky, and the rationale incorporated, Yasnovsky discloses collecting statistical information in regards to advertisements such indicating the number of times ads are displayed, number of clicks, etc. (Paragraph 0052)

As per dependent claim 59, Evans et al discloses wherein at least one of the steps of selecting at least one set of subcreatives, selecting a plurality of subsets of subcreatives, and assembling a plurality of aggregate creative forms is further executed according to scheduling criteria for transmission to users. (Paragraph 0093, 0094: Discloses a scheduling process for creating the advertisement and distributing the advertisement)

As per dependent claim 60, Evans et al discloses wherein at least one of the steps of selecting at least one set of subcreatives, selecting a plurality of subsets of subcreatives, and assembling a plurality of aggregate creative forms is further executed according to criteria for targeting transmission to specific users. (e.g. Paragraph 0093, 0094, 0095: Discloses scheduling criteria, user setup criteria)

As per dependent claim 61, Evans et al discloses the aggregate creative definition enables the step of assembling a plurality of aggregate creative forms to occur

even if a prescribed number of subcreatives is not available in one of the subsets of subcreatives. (Paragraph 0088, 0095)

As per dependent claim 62, Claim 62 recites similar limitations as in Claim 45 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Evans et al discloses the advertising system is configured to select aggregate creatives and non-aggregate creatives for transmission to users on the electronic network. (Paragraph 0063-0065, 0088, 0095: Template that contains the ad themes is selected to create the advertisement)

As per independent claim 63, Claim 63 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 66, Claim 66 recites similar limitations as in Claim 49 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 67, Claim 67 recites similar limitations as in Claim 50 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 68, Claim 68 recites similar limitations as in Claim 51 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 69, Claim 69 recites similar limitations as in Claim 52 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 70, Claim 70 recites similar limitations as in Claim 53 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 71, Claim 71 recites similar limitations as in Claim 54 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 72, Claim 72 recites similar limitations as in Claim 55 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 75, Claim 75 recites similar limitations as in Claim 58 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 76, Claim 76 recites similar limitations as in Claim 59 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 77, Claim 77 recites similar limitations as in Claim 60 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 78, Claim 78 recites similar limitations as in Claim 61 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 79, Claim 79 recites similar limitations as in Claim 62 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent claim 80, Claim 80 recites similar limitations as in Claim 46 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 83, Claim 83 recites similar limitations as in Claim 49 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 84, Claim 84 recites similar limitations as in Claim 50 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 85, Claim 85 recites similar limitations as in Claim 51 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 86, Claim 86 recites similar limitations as in Claim 52 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 87, Claim 87 recites similar limitations as in Claim 53 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 88, Claim 88 recites similar limitations as in Claim 54 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 89, Claim 89 recites similar limitations as in Claim 55 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 92, Claim 92 recites similar limitations as in Claim 58 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 93, Claim 93 recites similar limitations as in Claim 59 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 94, Claim 94 recites similar limitations as in Claim 60 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 95, Claim 95 recites similar limitations as in Claim 61 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 96, Claim 96 recites similar limitations as in Claim 62 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

11. Claims 47-48, 56, 64-65, 73, 81-82, and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al (US PGPub 20020036654, published 3/28/2002) in further view of Yasnovsky et al (US PG Pub 20050027594, filed 11/3/2003, provisional application filed on 7/28/2003) in further view of Alao et al (US PGPub 20020147645, published 10/10/2002)

As per dependent claims 47-48, and 56, Evans and Yasnovsky et al fail to specifically disclose applying weighting criteria to the selected set of subcreatives in the at least one subcreative pool, wherein the plurality of subsets of subcreatives are selected according to the weighting criteria and wherein the aggregate creative definition includes one or more constraints for the step of selecting at least one set of subcreatives, the one or more constraints determining permitted combinations of subcreatives for the at least one set of subcreatives. Since each subset has at least subcreative or just one, it has a combination of one. Therefore each subset has/is a subcreative. Thus, Alao et al discloses how advertisements are to be chosen based on constraints such as advertisement priority, advertisement weight, minimum advertisement display time, industry exclusions, overall frequency cap, minimum rotation interval, advertisement spec, advertisement type, and advertisement target. (Paragraph 0146, lines 15-21) Alao et al further details how ad-weighting works based on priority. (Paragraph 0146, lines 21-29) These constraints affect the level the priority thus changing the constraints producing a different list of order (combination) of display. Furthermore, when each advertisement item is edited or altered to include weight or constraints, it is considered generating a new or "copied" advertisement item with weight since it is different than the original unaltered advertisement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Evans et al and Yasnovsky et al with Alao et al's method since Alao et al's method would have provided a method for adaptive delivery of advertisements to a client.

Claims 64-65 recite similar limitations as in Claims 47-48 and are similarly rejected under rationale.

Claims 73 recite similar limitations as in Claim 56 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

Claims 81-82 recite similar limitations as in Claims 47-48 and are similarly rejected under rationale.

Claims 90 recite similar limitations as in Claim 56 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

12. Claims 57, 74, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Evan et al (US PGPub 20020036654, published 3/28/2002) in further view of Yasnovsky et al (US PG Pub 20050027594, filed 11/3/2003, provisional application filed on 7/28/2003) in further view of Aphek (US PG Pub 20030191693, filed 4/8/2002)

As per dependent claim 57, Evans et al and Yasnovsky fail to specifically disclose wherein the step of assembling a plurality of aggregate creative forms occurs off-line from when the aggregate creative is selected for transmission. However, Aphek discloses the ability to create an advertisement off-line using the soft program for creating advertisements before transmitting the advertisement online to a Web server. (Abstract, Paragraph 0010-0011)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified Evan et al's and Yannovksy's method with

Aphek's method since Aphek's method would have provided the benefit of allowing advertisers to create and update graphical ads in an instant and independent manner without any delays and whenever desire.

As per dependent claim 74, Claim 74 recites similar limitations as in Claim 57 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent claim 91, Claim 91 recites similar limitations as in Claim 57 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 28 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. On pages 13-14, in regards to Applicant's argument of claims 63-96 rejected under 35 USC 101, Applicant argues the claims therefore comply with the statutory subject matter requirement. However, Claims 63-96 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 101. For claims 63-79, the claim language in the claims failed to disclose or mention what is included a system at all; thus, the claims are viewed as software in view of data structures. The use of the word "system" does not inherently mean that claim is directed to a physical machine. For claims 80-96, The specification failed to specifically disclose or mention the term "a storage device" or what a storage device comprises at all; (i.e. memory, hard drive) thus, the claims are viewed as software in view of data structures. Therefore, the claims, themselves, lack the necessary physical articles or objects to

constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se. Thus, in regards to claims 63-96, the claims, as written, appear to be claiming "software systems" i.e. systems without hardware indication, which is computer program per se. The claims as written do not recite any hardware indication, therefore, viewed as "software systems".

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 63-96 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Arguments addressing in regards of the new limitations of Claims 63-96 brought forth in the amendment rotating through the at least one set of more than one subcreative; and selecting, during the step of rotating, a plurality of subsets of subcreatives to be included in the plurality of aggregate creative forms, the plurality of subsets of subcreatives including different combinations of more than one subcreative has been viewed the new ground of rejection of 35 USC 103(a) under new references using Yasnovsky et al.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2178

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David Faber/
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

	/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
--	--